



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/581,511	10/06/2000	Raymond Andersen	108281-00000	6795
4372	7590	04/21/2008		
ARENT FOX LLP 1050 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, N.W. SUITE 400 WASHINGTON, DC 20036			EXAMINER LUKTON, DAVID	
			ART UNIT 1654	PAPER NUMBER
			NOTIFICATION DATE 04/21/2008	DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

DCIPDocket@arentfox.com
IPMatters@arentfox.com
Patent_Mail@arentfox.com

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/581,511	Applicant(s) ANDERSEN ET AL.	
	Examiner DAVID LUKTON	Art Unit 1654	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 February 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 23-25, 27, 29, 31-66 and 68-78 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 24, 27, 29, 34, 36, 59, 60 and 62 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 23, 25, 31-33, 35, 37-58, 61, 63-66, 68-73 and 75-78 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 74 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Pursuant to the directives of the amendment filed 2/8/08, several claims have been amended. Claims 23-25, 27, 29, 31-66, 68-78 remain pending.

Claims 24, 27, 29, 34, 36, 59, 60, 62 remain withdrawn from consideration. (Claim 74 is now rejoined). The claim listing provided by applicants (2/8/08) characterizes claim 36 as under examination, rather than withdrawn. This claim does not encompass the elected compound. However, the possibility of rejoining claim 36 will be considered if applicants will explain how it is possible that upon joining R₁ and R₂ (together with the nitrogen atom to which they are bonded), a cyclopropyl, cyclobutyl (etc.) group will be formed. Given the presence of a nitrogen atom, one would expect an aziridine ring, or an azacyclobutyl, pyrrolidine or piperidine ring to be formed. (Applicants are invited to explain their thinking on this).

The following claims are examined in this Office action: 23, 25, 31-33, 35, 37-58, 61, 63-66, 68-78.

Applicants' arguments filed 2/8/08 have been considered and found persuasive.

Claims 23, 25, 31-33, 35, 37-58, 61, 63-66, 68-73, 75-78 are now characterized as allowable.



The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. §112:

Art Unit: 1654

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it in such full, clear, concise and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claim 74 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

Applicants have provided evidence that the compound “SPA-110” exhibited some efficacy in the treatment of colon cancer in an animal model. Also shown is that this compound was effective *in vitro* against breast cancer (MCF-7) cells and lung carcinoma (A549) cells.

Claim 74 is drawn to a method of “treating tumors ... in a patient”. Thus, any and all tumor types would be encompassed. Most of the following, for example, would be encompassed:

fibrosarcoma, myosarcoma, liposarcoma, chondrosarcoma, osteogenic sarcoma, chordoma, angiosarcoma, endotheliosarcoma, lymphangiosarcoma, lymphangioendotheliosarcoma, synovioma, mesothelioma, Ewing's tumor, leiomyosarcoma, rhabdomyosarcoma, gastric cancer, esophageal cancer, rectal cancer, pancreatic cancer, ovarian cancer, prostate cancer, uterine cancer, cancer of the head and neck, skin cancer, brain cancer, squamous cell carcinoma, sebaceous gland carcinoma, papillary carcinoma, papillary adenocarcinoma, cystadenocarcinoma, medullary carcinoma, bronchogenic carcinoma, renal cell carcinoma, hepatoma, bile duct carcinoma, choriocarcinoma, seminoma, embryonal carcinoma, Wilm's tumor, cervical cancer, testicular cancer, small cell lung carcinoma, non-small cell lung carcinoma, bladder carcinoma, epithelial carcinoma, glioma, astrocytoma, medulloblastoma, craniopharyngioma, ependymoma, pinealoma, hemangioblastoma, acoustic neuroma, oligodendroglioma, meningioma,

Art Unit: 1654

melanoma, neuroblastoma, retinoblastoma, leukemia, lymphoma, Kaposi sarcoma, or multiple myeloma

The following references discuss the matter of various attempts by oncologists to treat cancer: Viallet (*Lung Cancer* **15** (3) 367-73, 1996); Kemeny (*Seminars in Oncology* **21** (4 Suppl 7) 67-75, 1994); Newton (*Expert Opinion on Investigational Drugs* **9** (12) 2815-29, 2000); Giese (*Journal of Cancer Research and Clinical Oncology* **127** (4) 217-25, 2001); Garattini (*European Journal of Cancer* **37** Suppl 8 S128-47, 2001); Ragnhammar (*Acta Oncologica* **40** (2-3) 282-308, 2001). As is evident, attempts to treat cancer using agents which have exhibited *in vitro* activity leads to "unpredictable" results. In addition, of the few agents that have shown efficacy in the treatment of one form of cancer, not a single one is effective against all other forms of cancer, or even most forms of cancer. The claimed peptides are unlikely to be effective against a broad spectrum of solid tumor types, such as pancreatic cancer.

As stated in *Ex parte Forman* (230 USPQ 546, 1986) and *In re Wands* (8 USPQ2d 1400, Fed. Cir., 1988) the factors to consider in evaluating the need (or absence of need) for "undue experimentation" are the following: quantity of experimentation necessary, amount of direction or guidance presented, presence or absence of working examples, nature of the invention, state of the prior art, relative skill of those in that art, predictability or unpredictability of the art, and breadth of the claims.

Art Unit: 1654

Given the unpredictability in the art, the skilled oncologist would conclude that “undue experimentation” is required to treat any and all forms of cancer.

One option would be to claim the following:

A method of treating colon cancer comprising administering to a patient in need thereof an anti-mitotic effective amount of a compound according to claim 23.

According to one school of thought, enablement may also exist for the following:

A method of inhibiting mitosis of a tumor cell comprising contacting the tumor cell with an effective amount of a compound according to claim 23.



Claim 74 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112 second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 74 is dependent on a cancelled claim.



THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a). The practice of automatically extending the shortened statutory period an additional month upon filing of a timely first response to a final rejection has been discontinued by the Office. See 1021 TMOG 35.

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RESPONSE TO THIS FINAL ACTION IS SET TO EXPIRE THREE MONTHS FROM THE DATE OF THIS ACTION. IN THE EVENT A FIRST RESPONSE IS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE MAILING DATE OF THIS FINAL ACTION AND THE ADVISORY ACTION IS NOT MAILED UNTIL AFTER THE END OF THE THREE MONTH SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD, THEN THE SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD WILL EXPIRE ON THE DATE THE ADVISORY ACTION IS MAILED AND ANY EXTENSION FEE PURSUANT TO 37 CFR 1.136(a) WILL BE CALCULATED FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THE ADVISORY ACTION. IN NO EVENT

Art Unit: 1654

WILL THE STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RESPONSE EXPIRE LATER THAN SIX MONTHS FROM THE DATE OF THIS FINAL ACTION.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David Lukton whose telephone number is 571-272-0952. The examiner can normally be reached Monday-Friday from 9:30 to 6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Cecilia Tsang, can be reached at (571)272-0562. The fax number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 571-272-1600.

/David Lukton/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1654